

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

APRIL 24, 1943

VOL. VIII, No. 1200—PUBLICATION 1929

Contents

	Page
THE WAR	
Japanese Trial and Execution of American Aviators:	
Statement by the President	337
United States Communication of April 12, 1943 to the Japanese Government	337
Raw Materials—War and Post-War: Address by Herbert Feis	339
Greek Relief	347
Award of the Medal for Merit	348
AMERICAN REPUBLICS	
Address by the President at Monterrey, Mexico	348
Visit to the United States of the President of Bolivia .	350
Distinguished Visitors From Ecuador and Uruguay .	350
COMMERCIAL POLICY	
Extension of the Trade Agreements Act	350
CANADA	
Visit to the United States of the Governor General of Canada	350
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES, COMMISSIONS, ETC.	
Bermuda Meeting on the Refugee Problem: Address by the Chairman of the American Delegation	351
United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture .	353

[OVER]



Contents—CONTINUED

	Page
TREATY INFORMATION	
Agriculture:	
Development of Foodstuffs Production in Brazil . . .	353
Cooperative Rubber Investigations in Costa Rica . . .	353
Health: Health and Sanitation Agreement With Venezuela	354
Military Missions: Agreement With El Salvador	354
Amity: Treaty Between China and Iraq	355
Strategic Materials: Agreement Regarding the 1943 Cuban Sugar Crop	355
PUBLICATIONS	356
LEGISLATION	356

The War

JAPANESE TRIAL AND EXECUTION OF AMERICAN AVIATORS

Statement by the President

[Released to the press by the White House April 21]

It is with a feeling of deepest horror, which I know will be shared by all civilized peoples, that I have to announce the barbarous execution by the Japanese Government of some of the members of this country's armed forces who fell into Japanese hands as an incident of warfare.

The press has just carried the details of the American bombing of Japan a year ago. The crews of two of the American bombers were captured by the Japanese. On October 19, 1942 this Government learned from Japanese radio broadcasts of the capture, trial, and severe punishment of those Americans. Continued endeavor was made to obtain confirmation of those reports from Tokyo. It was not until March 12, 1943 that the American Government received the communication given by the Japanese Government stating that these Americans had in fact been tried and that the death penalty had been pronounced against them. It

was further stated that the death penalty was commuted for some but that the sentence of death had been applied to others.

This Government has vigorously condemned this act of barbarity in a formal communication sent to the Japanese Government. In that communication this Government has informed the Japanese Government that the American Government will hold personally and officially responsible for these diabolical crimes all of those officers of the Japanese Government who have participated therein and will in due course bring those officers to justice.

This recourse by our enemies to frightfulness is barbarous. The effort of the Japanese war-lords thus to intimidate us will utterly fail. It will make the American people more determined than ever to blot out the shameless militarism of Japan.

I have instructed the Department of State to make public the text of our communication to the Japanese Government.

United States Communication of April 12, 1943 to the Japanese Government

[Released to the press April 21]

The Government of the United States has received the reply of the Japanese Government conveyed under date of February 17, 1943, to the Swiss Minister at Tokyo to the inquiry made by the Minister on behalf of the Government of the United States concerning the correctness of reports broadcast by Japanese radio stations that the Japanese authorities intended to try

before military tribunals American prisoners of war, for military operations, and to impose upon them severe penalties including even the death penalty.

The Japanese Government states that it has tried the members of the crews of American planes who fell into Japanese hands after the raid on Japan on April 18 last, that they were sentenced to death and that, following commu-

tation of the sentence for the larger number of them, the sentence of death was applied to certain of the accused.

The Government of the United States has subsequently been informed of the refusal of the Japanese Government to treat the remaining American aviators as prisoners of war, to divulge their names, to state the sentences imposed upon them or to permit visits to them by the Swiss Minister as representative of the protecting Power for American interests.

The Japanese Government alleges that it has subjected the American aviators to this treatment because they intentionally bombed non-military installations and deliberately fired on civilians, and that the aviators admitted these acts.

The Government of the United States informs the Japanese Government that instructions to American armed forces have always ordered those forces to direct their attacks upon military objectives. The American forces participating in the attack on Japan had such instructions and it is known that they did not deviate therefrom. The Government of the United States brands as false the charge that American aviators intentionally have attacked non-combatants anywhere.

With regard to the allegation of the Japanese Government that the American aviators admitted the acts of which the Japanese Government accuses them, there are numerous known instances in which Japanese official agencies have employed brutal and bestial methods in extorting alleged confessions from persons in their power. It is customary for those agencies to use statements obtained under torture, or alleged statements, in proceedings against the victims.

If the admissions alleged by the Japanese Government to have been made by the American aviators were in fact made, they could only have been extorted fabrications.

Moreover, the Japanese Government entered into a solemn obligation by agreement with the Government of the United States to observe the terms of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. Article 1 of that Convention provides for treatment as prisoners of war of members

of armies and of persons captured in the course of military operations at sea or in the air. Article 60 provides that upon the opening of a judicial proceeding directed against a prisoner of war, the representative of the protecting Power shall be given notice thereof at least three weeks prior to the trial and of the names and charges against the prisoners who are to be tried. Article 61 provides that no prisoner may be obliged to admit himself guilty of the act of which he is accused. Article 62 provides that the accused shall have the assistance of qualified counsel of his choice and that a representative of the protecting Power shall be permitted to attend the trial. Article 65 provides that sentence pronounced against the prisoners shall be communicated to the protecting Power immediately. Article 66 provides, in the event that the death penalty is pronounced, that the details as to the nature and circumstances of the offense shall be communicated to the protecting Power, for transmission to the Power in whose forces the prisoner served, and that the sentence shall not be executed before the expiration of a period of at least three months after such communication. The Japanese Government has not complied with any of these provisions of the Convention in its treatment of the captured American aviators.

The Government of the United States calls again upon the Japanese Government to carry out its agreement to observe the provisions of the Convention by communicating to the Swiss Minister at Tokyo the charges and sentences imposed upon the American aviators, by permitting the Swiss representatives to visit those now held in prison, by restoring to those aviators the full rights to which they are entitled under the Prisoners of War Convention, and by informing the Minister of the names and disposition or place of burial of the bodies of any of the aviators against whom sentence of death has been carried out.

If, as would appear from its communication under reference, the Japanese Government has descended to such acts of barbarity and manifestations of depravity as to murder in cold blood uniformed members of the American

armed forces made prisoners as an incident of warfare, the American Government will hold personally and officially responsible for those deliberate crimes all of those officers of the Japanese Government who have participated in their commitment and will in due course bring those officers to justice.

The American Government also solemnly warns the Japanese Government that for any other violations of its undertakings as regards

American prisoners of war or for any other acts of criminal barbarity inflicted upon American prisoners in violation of the rules of warfare accepted and practiced by civilized nations as military operations now in progress draw to their inexorable and inevitable conclusion, the American Government will visit upon the officers of the Japanese Government responsible for such uncivilized and inhumane acts the punishment they deserve.

RAW MATERIALS: WAR AND POST-WAR

Address by Herbert Feis¹

[Released to the press April 19]

I

The winds that blow over the surface of the earth emerge, according to ancient fable, from four large caves in which they dwell when not abroad. The winds of thought that sweep the human mind have similar ways. They—modern fable informs us—emerge from caverns of the human soul, those several realms which make up our nature. Without claiming authority on the subject, I choose, for tonight, to identify these realms as three in number, and their names—the realm of nightmare, the realm of wishful fantasy (which for simplicity's sake might be known as the realm of fancy), and the realm of reality. You will recognize that the realm of nightmare and the realm of wishful fantasy are but parts of the larger kingdom of dreams.

The impression prevails that during our waking hours our thoughts steadily dwell in the realm of reality and are concerned only with its affairs. But that is not so. Thoughts emerging from their several realms are skilled in disguising their origins and associate with each other in free and easy disorder. It is particularly difficult for any thought to live continuously in the realm of reality and to keep

company only with other thoughts that belong in the same realm. As soon as attention is relaxed the children of nightmare and fancy slip in, and even those thoughts that have spent long years in the classrooms of reality are prone to dance off with the others in a spirited Virginia Reel—a dance in which our fears and forebodings and our desires give the lead.

Fear is the parent of the nightmare brood, and her armies are numerous and insistently active. They are lightning swift in movement, and given to stampeding, then enlisting all other thoughts. They then all wear the uniform of our fears.

The garments worn by the children of pleasant fantasy are lovely and their voices are consoling. The doors of the mind are always open to them. For the costume of reality is often plain and wrinkled and badly tailored to our individual lives, and only the stubborn and the disciplined can wear it with satisfaction. This is particularly true of the young, whose thoughts, like debutantes, need greatly to see beauty in the mirror.

The aids at hand in properly locating our thoughts, for determining from what realms they have emerged and where they dwell, are few and defective compared with those that help to locate us bodily. For that purpose we have compasses simple to read, instruments on ship and plane that would inform us by a quick glance at the dial that we were in the heart of the city of Chicago. But where are the instru-

¹ Delivered before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill., Apr. 19, 1943. Mr. Feis is Adviser on International Economic Affairs, Department of State.

ments that might tell us when we are in the heart of darkness? Where the devices, like those that signal the presence of nearby objects by measuring changing temperatures or the rate of rebound of sound waves, to warn us that our thoughts are close to the treacherous pit of nightmare or soaring miles above the earth?

We have only our experience and memory to guide us, and the tales and axioms of wise men. We have to get along as best we can with a pocket edition of Plato and a confused understanding of Freud. Such alone is the character of the aids we possess to identify the realms out of which our thoughts do stream. Is it to be wondered then that the task of locating thought about any difficult international question properly, as between the several realms, is so difficult?

II

There are, alas, only too many illustrative proofs of that fact in recent American history.

Recall first a few clear instances in which thoughts from the nightmare realm were accepted as belonging to reality. How often in the whole past 10 years, when under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act a tariff duty was reduced, the belief spread that the consequence would be the destruction of an industry. When, for example, the duty on manganese was cut in the trade agreement with Brazil, the representatives of the regions possessing uncertain and relatively high-cost deposits declared we were sacrificing the safety of the United States; and producers in Cuba were convinced that they would find it no longer possible to operate. Events proved that their judgments were in the realm of nightmare. Or again, when a small quantity of cattle were permitted entry into the United States at reduced tariff rate as a consequence of the trade agreement with Canada, the whole cattle-raising West seemed genuinely to think their prospects permanently destroyed. The event proved quite otherwise.

Thoughts of the same kind, more broadly diffused among the people, attended the enactment of the various financial and social reforms of

1933-1934. In fact, so strong were these children of fear then that it is doubtful that needed reforms could have been effected if the condition of the country had not been so miserable. A nightmare warning was sounded among us that "grass would grow upon the streets".

To proceed to current instance: The nightmare thought is abroad that American economic life is destined to be permanently stagnant and that all established arrangements for the production and distribution of goods are damaged beyond repair. It leaves in its train the nightmare conclusion either that permanent depression and disorder are our destined lot or that we shall be forced to make great and undesired changes in our economic institutions. This thought, I believe, will prove of the nightmare variety. We shall undoubtedly find it wise constantly to make many gradual changes and readjustments; but these should enable us to improve our condition, not bring ruin upon us.

Human beings are most likely to yield to a nightmare version of reality when—as at present—they are faced with the prospect of unpredictable change. It is all the more imperative, then, that we stand guard against that mistake. If too often the guardians of the night are summoned to deal with wolves that turn out to be sheep, ultimately the night is left without guardians.

None of us have sympathy, in retrospect, for mistakes of this type. It is far easier to be sympathetic with the contrasting error, when the children of pleasant fantasy are mistaken for reality. But the consequences may be no less serious. Memory will quickly illustrate that fact.

You will recall the Kellogg pact for the renunciation of war in the first article of which the governments of the world solemnly declared "in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in relations with one another".

The error lay not in the act of negotiating this agreement but in the belief that by so doing we had done all that was necessary or feasible.

sible to try to safeguard peace. The thought was that if governments gave combined affirmation in this form of their moral and peaceful intentions, the conduct of all would be in conformity with their vow. It was not desired to mar this pleasant fantasy by taking heed of the hints that remembered reality gave, by facing the evident fact that if one or two powerful nations follow a determined warlike course, other nations will be faced with a choice between checking them early or late. Fancy prompted the belief that all nations by declaring their will for peace would become peaceful, and that the dangers and difficulties of maintaining an international political system, with its burdens and confining effect, could be avoided. As Secretary of State Kellogg explained at the time to the French Government:

"The ideal which inspires the effort so sincerely and so hopefully put forward by your Government and mine is arresting and appealing just because of its purity and simplicity; and I cannot avoid the feeling that if Governments should publicly acknowledge that they can only deal with this ideal in a technical spirit and must insist upon the adoption of reservations impairing, if not utterly destroying the true significance of their common endeavors, they would be in effect only recording their impotence, to the keen disappointment of mankind in general."

The prompting desire is not to be mocked at. Ultimately international peace will only be established when and as all nations are willing to subject themselves to the moral laws of peace and, subduing their combative impulses, abstain from taking advantage of each other's weaknesses, put hate aside, and lessen the injustices that provoke to strife. No machinery of international organization will ultimately succeed unless mankind progresses toward such behavior. Disappointment in the past effectiveness of the moral law must not lead to the conclusion that political mechanism, in itself, can be a substitute; such an error would lead to disappointment no less grievous. But our lifetime experience illustrates the necessity for establishing

arrangements wherein those nations which wish to live by the moral law combine to support and strengthen it, and to render each other positive assistance that makes this course easier to pursue, and to check attempts to prevail by force.

The judgment that found expression in the Kellogg pact persisted in the minds of many until the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. There were millions among us who did not recognize the real nature of the regime of Germany, Italy, and Japan, the terrible meaning and consequence of their devotion to military matters, and their calculating and unrestrained readiness to resort to force whenever their harsh will might be opposed. Fancy proffered another and more consoling version of events. The garments of the thoughts of reality were indeed in this instance unattractive and wrinkled. Those who are wearing them on the grim battlefield are now endowing them for all of us with a sorrowful beauty.

These instances illustrate how difficult it is and how essential it is to know in which realm one's thoughts dwell. The truly useful thought we must conclude is one that, preserving intimate contact with the realms of fear and fantasy, survives and becomes effective in the realms of reality. A remembrance of fear gives it the necessary element of prudence, and the spur of pleasant fantasy gives it creative hope and inspiration.

III

To identify the mistakes of the past is relatively easy. To identify the wisdom of the future is far more difficult. I summon courage, therefore, as I turn to a problem of future consequence: that of the availability and distribution of raw materials among the nations. How are we to distinguish those strains of current thought that will serve the future well, from those that will prove only wayward children of nightmare or of fancy?

The question before the United States in this field is so to shape policy that our national interests will be safeguarded, while at the same time contributing to the creation of international conditions equitable and beneficial to all

nations. We must seek to be assured that adequate supplies of raw materials are available at all times, tranquil or disturbed, on fair terms and without the necessity of having to make unjust concessions to obtain them. Every other country will have this same general aim. We failed, in the years preceding our entry into the war, sufficiently to appreciate the need of assuring ourselves of raw-material reserves. Financial appropriations available for the accumulation of reserve stockpiles of raw materials up to the time of the fall of France were trivial. The consequences have been costly. It is now necessary to use, under conditions of danger and loss, many ships to carry the supplies needed for war production and to devote ill-spared naval vessels to protect these ships. We have been forced to most sparing use even for war purposes of many materials. We have been compelled to devote much labor and large quantities of material to the construction of plants for the manufacture of substitutes—particularly for the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

This error of past judgment has led some to conclude that in the future we must necessarily pursue the extreme opposite course. The argument is being advanced by some that thenceforward we should become and remain wholly self-sufficient, no matter what the cost or the effect on the economic condition of other nations, that we should strive to the utmost to produce within our own borders all the raw materials we may need at any time, and assure ourselves control of external sources of those few raw materials in which even science could not make us self-sufficient. Should the future world turn out to be one in which force counts, in which nations live in wrathful separation, and trade is strictly controlled, we should be compelled to follow such a course. But if the nations give determined expression to present views, and the controlling authority of the world rests in the hands of peaceful nations solidly joined together to maintain the peace and facilitate trade, then surely the pursuit of a policy of self-sufficiency could be allocated

to the nightmare realm and kept under strict confinement.

Prudence will require, until nations have shown that they can live together in prolonged peace and trust, that we maintain such organizations and establishments as might be essential in some unanticipated crisis, and the permanent maintenance of reserves of those few critical materials upon the supply of which we could not count with certainty. Of these, perhaps petroleum is the most important, for our own domestic reserves are being heavily depleted by the war demands of the United Nations. However, as far as is consistent with the demands of prudence, considerations of production cost and economic benefit should control in the making of our decisions and supplies should be drawn from cheaper and better outside sources in preference to more expensive and less satisfactory domestic sources.

As we shall ask other nations fairly to recognize our needs, we must be ready to recognize theirs. In the past this country has ordinarily done so. The raw materials at our command have been freely available to all. So conscious were we of this obligation that we forebore to interrupt wholly supplies to Japan for long months after its hostile intentions became clear; this was not appeasement: it was recognition of the gravity of departing from our ordinary course.

IV

Many suggestions are being advanced which contemplate international action, of one sort or another, as regards the supply, control, or distribution of raw materials among the nations. They differ greatly in purpose and scope.

Several of the more likely stem from a desire to give effect to article 4 of the Atlantic Charter, which reads:

"They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

The full interpretation of this statement of joint purpose may be long debated. Its most evident meaning, however, would appear to require that countries should accept a mutual obligation to make possible the acquisition by all of raw materials through trade on terms that are equal and favorable to economic development. Presumably this obligation would include synthetic raw materials as well as natural ones.

What undertakings might governments be required to give one another to translate this principle into formal international agreement?

First: Pledge to refrain from exercising unfair monopoly restraints, either individually or in combination, over the production and export of raw materials. Since there are very few commodities over the main supply of which any one country could with continued effectiveness exercise such monopoly control, the question resolves itself practically into a matter of the combined action of several governments. Such, for example, are the arrangements that have existed for the regulation and for the production or export of tin, rubber, sugar, and coffee.

Agreements which lead to the exercise of control over the adjustment of supply to demand are not necessarily injurious; in fact, properly conceived and directed, they may in some instances have satisfactory results. It will be essential to assure that any such agreements should not be directed by narrow monopoly aims for monopoly gains; they would have to be so devised and operated as to assure ample supply on equal and favorable terms—which means full opportunity for efficient low-cost producers. The establishment of genuine international management of such agreements is necessary to guard against the possibility of misuse.

Second: An undertaking on the part of governments as regards the nature and limits of the taxes or restrictions that each could impose upon the export of raw materials produced within their territories. It is not to be expected that all governments will agree to abstain completely from imposing such taxes or restrictions; nor would that be necessary to give substantial fulfilment to the purpose in mind. That would be

served if countries would join in the acceptance of a general obligation to keep such taxes moderate in character and to employ them only when thoroughly justified by budgetary or other needs—experience alone will prove whether it is possible to draw together all, or almost all, countries in any one single agreement of this type. Alternatively, the same result might be attained by a series of agreements between particular countries the terms and benefits of which are extended to all others willing to grant, in turn, equivalent opportunities. Such agreements, whether universal or particular, should specify that the fees and restrictions on export that might be maintained by any participating country should be non-discriminatory, that is, apply equally as regards exports to all other countries that follow the same practice.

The present comprehensive restrictions over exports now existing in every country must be greatly reduced. The prospect is that most raw materials will be in ample supply; and therefore, given a prospect of sustained peace, there will be little incentive after the first short period of emergency adjustment to retain them. The process of elimination of present restrictions will necessarily be somewhat gradual. It might well be expedited by particular agreements between particular countries, the terms of which were extended to all. In this matter also, it should prove feasible to contrive agreements whereby each country would obligate itself to apply equally as between all other foreign countries any measures of restriction it retained.

Whether or not formal international agreements designed to effect the purposes set forth in article 4 of the Atlantic Charter are negotiated, the economic significance to any country of having equal access to the raw materials will depend upon the measure of opportunity it finds to sell its own products abroad. The ability of any country to purchase raw materials from others is limited by its ability to pay. For most countries the proceeds of its own exports are the chief means of acquiring the means of payment. Broadly speaking, this is true no matter what the variety of methods for conducting trade

V

There are many proposals current for the establishment of intergovernmental control over the production, price, and distribution of raw materials throughout the world. These differ greatly in scope and in substance and no brief comment can apply with equal justice and accuracy to them all.

Commodity agreements of the type I have already touched upon are the simplest form proposed: in these each country regulates its own production or export in accordance with joint decisions; the actual international administrative machinery is rudimentary. But experience shows that unless there should be created, as a feature of such a scheme, a pool out of which raw materials were made available according to need and not necessarily according to ability to pay, distribution as between the different countries of the world is not significantly altered.

Some current proposals contemplate the creation of such an international pool either of some or all raw materials. Apart from other problems that such suggestion presents—for example, as to whether synthetic materials should be included as well as natural materials—they raise the basic question of who would put up the funds to pay the producers. If the purpose is to make raw materials available to some countries in excess of their ordinary ability to pay for them, someone must make a loan or gift. Nations might be willing, individually or collectively, to give some measure of financial assistance, especially short-term financial assistance to tide each other over. Would they be willing to do more—say, perhaps, as regards the supply of food?

If there should be brought into existence after the war a deeply felt international political accord to govern the behavior of nations, it would be in place to establish an arrangement whereby countries jointly strove to assure that all obtained a sufficient supply of food for health and happiness. In other terms, the satisfaction of minimum standards of food consumption at low cost might be accepted as an international obligation. Of all international economic measures, this is the one whereby needy millions

Even though trade restrictions should universally be moderate, there will always remain differences in the basic economic terms on which different countries can acquire raw materials. Countries that possess rich and varied natural resources, abundant capital and industry, and are apt and effective in their production methods will find it easier to buy and pay for raw materials than countries that lack these advantages. The people of poorer countries will have to pay a greater cost, in terms of human effort, than those of wealthy countries. In order to obtain a gallon of gasoline, for example, the Chinese coolie will pay more in terms of hours of labor than the American worker; the native of India will have to work harder and longer to possess the wheat for a loaf of bread than the Australian.

Through well-ordered and patient international cooperation much can be achieved in the future to increase the productivity and the purchasing power of the people of poorer lands. Capital can be made available on conditions determined by a wish to render friendly assistance and not by ordinary commercial computations. Technical knowledge and guidance can be put at the service of all countries that are prepared to make sound use of them. These and other forms of international action can make it more possible for even the poorest country greatly to improve its situation. It would in fact be a natural extension of the aid that more developed industrial countries, such as the United States and Great Britain, have often given to other countries in the past—just as the early development of the United States was aided by foreign capital and enterprise.

might best be served by an international community.

The fulfilment of any such conception would require that during a considerable period at least some countries in one form or other make gifts of foodstuffs to others. But it would be important that from the very beginning each and every country show itself disposed to do its utmost, with outside cooperation, to meet its own needs by its own effort as far as it effectively can, so that in time the need of assistance from others would become small. To the achievement of that goal countries can give each other many forms of help of more lasting benefit than financial help—in such matters, for example, as improvements of methods of cultivation, in irrigation projects, flood and pest control, and in the best ways of converting, preserving, and using foods. With such help many presently needy parts of the world will be able by their own effort greatly to increase their supply of foodstuffs.

The great increase in human ability to produce and in the knowledge of how to use it, now makes it possible to contemplate the provision of adequate food for all peoples. True, one dark shadowing possibility must be borne in mind lest the best-directed effort end in disappointment. If the population growth of any country or region is continuously excessive, and the number of mouths to be fed continuously grows as fast as Nature's increased yield and men's gifts, there hunger will remain the common suffering.

VI

The matter of ownership or the right to develop sources of raw materials will receive fresh scrutiny in the post-war period. The following comments are admittedly inadequate.

Each country possesses the right to control the ownership and exploitation of the raw materials located within its boundaries. The admission of foreign capital and enterprise into any country for this purpose is considered to be subject to the will of the government of that country, under conditions imposed by its laws. Countries will benefit, however, if that right is exercised in accord with international rule and

custom which seek to ban unjust or discriminatory treatment. The underlying economic intent of such rule and custom is sound: the encouragement of the development of sources of raw materials, no matter where located, for the use of all.

In the twenties an attempt was made to codify and embody in international agreements the terms on which countries would admit foreign capital for the development of raw materials, and the conditions foreign capital should observe. Such agreements would facilitate the development of new sources of raw-material supply. But prevailing tendencies do not encourage hope for immediate achievement along these lines. In many countries there exists a critical attitude toward foreign capital, a refusal to grant it opportunity, or to impose conditions that discourage. In some countries the right to own or develop raw materials has definitely been reserved for private or public national monopolies. There is some possibility that particular countries that have very strong commercial and financial links with each other and enjoy each other's full trust will work out agreements as between themselves. It is also possible that even though countries will not enter into formal international accords defining the opportunity that each would grant to foreign capital and enterprise, they might arrive at an understanding which established, as guiding principle, equality of opportunity between foreign interests.

In the absence of agreements the extent and terms of admission of foreign capital to develop raw materials will continue to be determined by calculations of mutual need and advantage. Recognition is required on the one hand by countries possessing important raw-material supplies that they cannot justly withhold them from the world's use, and on the other hand by capital which undertakes operations in a foreign country that the primary benefit from their operations must redound to the inhabitants of the country.

The question of the right to own and develop resources located within colonial or dependent areas is affected by some special considerations.

There is a growing body of opinion that the opportunities to own and exploit the raw-material resources of such areas must not be exclusively retained for the interests of the controlling country or imperial system but be fairly shared with qualified interests of all other friendly countries. It will prove internationally beneficial if such attitude wins general acceptance and support and could be embodied in international accords. But the means and forms of its realization must vary greatly as between different situations.

There are suggestions current for the substitution of direct international control for national control over the resources of certain types of territories. It is obviously far beyond my present opportunity adequately to comment on those suggestions. The aims that should guide are: First, protection of the interests of local populations; and, second, the facilitation of raw-material production by the application of the practice of the Open Door to the capital and enterprise of all countries. One way of advancing these aims would be to establish an international organization with authority carefully to review the policies pursued by countries in regard to the development of resources in the areas they control, and to correct abuses and injustices in the distribution of opportunity.

In some regions the countries most directly concerned may reach agreements either for the division of opportunity on terms open to all, or for joint operation; agreements of this type are especially to be desired in regard to important resources located in sparsely populated and dependent areas, which would become otherwise the subject of disturbing diplomatic and financial struggle.

By no means least important is the possibility of the creation of an international financial organization which could supply capital and direction for certain raw-material enterprises, conducting them throughout as international undertakings.

Even these inadequate comments will have indicated that the seams in the idea of equality of access are numerous, and their depth and

direction as yet unsettled. Their proper exploration and development require much more capital than I possess today.

VII

Science is increasing the variety and amount of our raw-material supplies through the creation of synthetics and plastics. This, like all new developments, will present some immediately serious problems of adjustment. Many countries, including the United States, will be called upon to make difficult decisions as regards the terms on which new synthetic products might compete in their markets with natural raw materials. The question is clearly on the horizon as regards natural and synthetic rubber, natural and synthetic fibers, and natural and synthetic petroleum. The areas producing the natural raw materials can fairly ask full consideration for the economic suffering they will face in the event that their product is seriously and abruptly displaced; on the other hand, the producers of synthetics and plastics are certain to feel themselves entitled to some measure of help during their period of development. As far as may be consistent with prudent consideration of national defense, economic considerations should be permitted to operate. It may be that in some fields it will be advisable to regulate the competition between natural and synthetic products by agreements, national and international.

The advent of synthetics and plastics means an immense potential addition to the supply of raw materials, with increased possibility of sufficiency for all on favorable terms. To assure this result and to assure that all nations may share in it, it would be necessary to provide by suitable national and international action that the supply of synthetics or plastics is not limited by monopoly control based on patents or secret agreements.

The availability of synthetics and plastics will lessen the significance of any present or future monopoly controls of natural raw materials. It will reduce international rivalry for the control over sources of raw materials in short supply and lessen concern on the part of

all countries as to who may control particular natural sources of supply.

In all these ways the development of synthetics and plastics could contribute to the improvement of international life. But that is not certain. The sense of countries of dependence on others for vital supplies has no doubt been at times in the past an irritating factor in their relations. But often it has been a restraining one; and if the need for restraint passes, some nations may use their newly gained freedom to act badly. Improved conditions make it easier for countries to improve their conduct in international affairs; they form no guaranty they will do so.

VIII

This attempt at identification and location of thoughts current regarding the raw-materials question must end. After I have fallen silent, the children of nightmare will no doubt mock at the points in which bold hopes were permitted to enter, and will continue their warning murmurs. The children of fancy will express keen disappointment at the suspense in which they have been left. The children of reality will go about their business wondering why I have talked so much and settled so little. I am glad to let them have the last word, asking only that present anguish shall be found in the end to have served a liberating and compassionate purpose.

GREEK RELIEF

[Released to the press April 19]

Inquiries have been received by the State Department regarding the operation of the Greek-relief scheme, resulting from the publication in the press of a report alleging that "Greek refugees who have recently fled to North Africa have reported to American officials there that the leakage [of relief foodstuffs] into enemy hands has been nearly 40 percent".

No such reports have reached this Department or other interested agencies from any American Government or Red Cross officials in

North Africa, or from any other source. On the contrary, this Government and the British Government have received regular reports through the Swedish Government, which has generously assumed responsibility for this scheme, under the general auspices of the International Red Cross Committee, confirming that the foodstuffs sent into Greece are being distributed to the Greek population without interference by the occupation authorities and that there has been no diversion of these supplies to the enemy. Furthermore, these reports indicate that the Axis authorities have entered into agreement with the Swedish-Swiss Relief Commission for the implementation of their pledge, given to the Swedish Government in connection with the negotiations preceding the initiation of the scheme, that Greek native produce would be reserved solely for normal peacetime residents of Greece except so far as local foodstuffs consumed by the armed forces or officials of the occupying powers are replaced by equivalent foodstuffs imported from Axis sources for the Greek population.

This Government's approval of the Greek-relief scheme was announced to the press by the Department of State on August 7, 1942,¹ on which date the first of the eight Swedish vessels engaged for the purpose departed from Montreal for Piraeus. These vessels, charter-hire on which is now being met principally by this Government, are carrying monthly quantities of 15,000 tons of wheat donated by the Canadian Government; 3,000 tons of dried vegetables and 300 tons of evaporated milk supplied by this Government; medical supplies furnished principally by the American Red Cross; and miscellaneous supplies and equipment donated by the Greek War Relief Association.

These relief supplies are distributed to the Greek people by a Neutral Relief Commission of 30 Swedish and Swiss nationals under the chairmanship of the distinguished Swedish jurist, Emil Sandstrom. The Commission is aided in its task by some 800 carefully selected Greek employees.

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1942, p. 686.

To insure its independent mobility, the Commission has been supplied with its own motor vehicles. It is in a position to insure close surveillance and control over the distribution of all relief supplies received and to report fully thereon to this Government and the British Government, which will of course agree to the continuance of the scheme only so long as they are satisfied that it is not in fact benefitting the enemy.

AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT

An Executive order of April 19, 1943 (no. 9331) establishes the membership of the "Medal for Merit" Board as follows:

The Secretary of State, *chairman*

The Secretary of War

The Secretary of the Navy

Rules and regulations governing the award of the medal were issued on the same day.¹

American Republics

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT MONTERREY, MEXICO

[Released to the press by the White House April 20]

Your Excellency's friendly and cordial expressions add to the very great pleasure which I feel at being here on Mexican soil.

It is an amazing thing to have to realize that nearly 34 years have passed since Chief Executives of our two nations have met face to face. I hope that in the days to come every Mexican and every American President will feel at liberty to visit each other just as neighbors visit each other—just as neighbors talk things over and get to know each other better.

Our two countries owe their independence to the fact that your ancestors and mine held the same truths to be worth fighting for and dying for. Hidalgo and Juarez were men of the same stamp as Washington and Jefferson. It was, therefore, inevitable that our two countries should find themselves alined together in the great struggle which is being fought today to determine whether this shall be a free or a slave world.

The attacks of the Axis powers during the past few years against our common heritage as free men culminated in the unspeakable and unprovoked aggressions of December 7, 1941 and

May 14, 1942 and the shedding of blood on those dates of citizens of the United States and of Mexico alike.

Those attacks did not find the Western Hemisphere unprepared. The 21 free republics of the Americas during the past 10 years have devised a system of international cooperation which has become a great bulwark in the defense of our heritage and our future. That system, whose strength is now evident even to the most skeptical, is based primarily upon a renunciation of the use of force and the enshrining of international justice and mutual respect as the governing rule of conduct by all nations.

In the forging of that new international policy the role of Mexico has been outstanding. Mexican Presidents and Foreign Ministers have appreciated the nature of the struggle with which we are now confronted at a time when many nations much closer to the focus of infection were blind.

¹ The order and the regulations are printed in the *Federal Register* of Apr. 27, 1943. The Board was created by Executive order of Dec. 24, 1942; see the BULLETIN of Dec. 26, p. 1022.

The wisdom of the measures which the statesmen of Mexico and the United States and of the other American republics have adopted at inter-American gatherings during recent years has been amply demonstrated. They have succeeded because they have been placed in effect not only by Mexico and the United States but by all except one of the other American republics.

You and I, Mr. President, as Commanders in Chief of our respective armed forces, have been able to concert measures for common defense. The harmony and mutual confidence which has prevailed between our Armies and Navies is beyond praise. Brotherhood in arms has been established.

The determination of the Mexican people and of their leaders has led to production on an all-out basis of strategic and vital materials so necessary to the forging of the weapons destined to compass the final overthrow of our common foe. In this great city of Monterrey I have been most impressed with the single-minded purpose with which all the forces of production are joined together in the war effort.

And Mexican farm workers, brought to the United States in accordance with an agreement between our two Governments, the terms of which are fully consonant with the social objectives we cherish together, are contributing their skill and their toil to the production of vitally needed food.

Not less important than the military cooperation and the supplies needed for the maintenance of our respective economies, has been the exchange of those ideas and of those moral values which give life and significance to the tremendous effort of the free peoples of the world. We in the United States have listened with admiration and profit to your statements and addresses, Mr. President, and to those of your distinguished Foreign Minister. We have gained inspiration and strength from your words.

In the shaping of a common victory our peoples are finding that they have common aspirations. They can work together for a common objective. Let us never lose our hold

upon that truth. It contains within it the secret of future happiness and prosperity for all of us on both sides of our unfortified border. Let us make sure that when our victory is won, when the forces of evil surrender—and that surrender shall be unconditional—then we, with the same spirit and with the same united courage, will face the task of the building of a better world.

There is much work still to be done by men of good-will on both sides of our border. The great Mexican people have their feet set upon a path of ever greater progress so that each citizen may enjoy the greatest possible measure of security and opportunity. The Government of the United States and my countrymen are ready to contribute to that progress.

We recognize a mutual interdependence of our joint resources. We know that Mexico's resources will be developed for the common good of humanity. We know that the day of the exploitation of the resources and the people of one country for the benefit of any group in another country is definitely over.

It is time that every citizen in every one of the American republics recognizes that the good-neighbor policy means that harm to one republic means harm to every republic. We have all of us recognized the principle of independence. It is time that we recognize also the privilege of interdependence—one upon another.

Mr. President, it is my hope that in the expansion of our common effort in this war and in the peace to follow we will again have occasion for friendly consultation in order further to promote the closest understanding and continued unity of purpose between our two peoples.

We have achieved close understanding and unity of purpose. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Mexican people for this opportunity to meet you on Mexican soil and to call you friends.

You and I are breaking another precedent. Let these meetings between Presidents of Mexico and the United States recur again and again and again.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA

[Released to the press April 23]

President Enrique Peñaranda of Bolivia is expected to arrive in Washington as a guest of President Roosevelt on May 5.

He will remain in the capital for about four days, after which he will visit war industries in Detroit and Buffalo and spend a few days in New York before leaving the country.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS FROM ECUADOR AND URUGUAY

[Released to the press April 23]

Oswaldo Guayasamín, young Ecuadorian artist, arrived in Washington on April 21 for a three months' visit to the United States at the invitation of the Department of State. Señor Guayasamín is interested in visiting art centers and acquainting himself with artistic activities in the United States.

Luis Gil Salguero, prominent Uruguayan philosopher and author, arrived in Washington on April 19 for a three months' visit to the United States at the invitation of the Department of State.

Commercial Policy

EXTENSION OF THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS ACT

Statement by the Secretary of State

[Released to the press April 24]

We can all be gratified with the showing of national unity which has been manifested

through spokesmen for all branches of American life at the hearings which were concluded yesterday before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I have discussed the matter with the chairmen of the committees of the House and Senate, and I entirely agree that this country's vital interests would be best served by a clear-cut continuance of the Trade Agreements Act for the customary three-year period as proposed in the pending legislation, and that there should be no amendment to this legislation, particularly at this time when we are most concerned that there may not be the slightest basis for doubt in anyone's mind concerning our steadfast determination to cooperate fully with like-minded nations in peace as well as in war.

Canada

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

[Released to the press April 24]

His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, the Earl of Athlone, accompanied by Her Royal Highness Princess Alice, is expected to arrive in Seattle, Washington, on May 3.

They will visit war industries in or near Seattle and Portland, Oregon, and expect to spend about five days in the United States.

In their party will be Sir Shuldharn Redfern, secretary to the Governor General, Miss Vera Grenfell, lady-in-waiting, and Capt. Alan Levenson-Gover, aide-de-camp.

International Conferences, Commissions, Etc.

BERMUDA MEETING ON THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Address by the Chairman of the American Delegation¹

I first wish to express to the Acting Governor and to the Government and people of Bermuda the sincere appreciation of the American Government and of the American delegation to this conference for the hospitality and courtesies shown to us. Bermuda has long been known to Americans as one of the most beautiful and legendary spots of the world—a place in which good-fellowship and friendship may be expected as a matter of course. I personally cherish many happy memories of visits to Bermuda under more peaceful and less trying conditions. It is pleasant to find that the special bonds created between the British Empire, of which Bermuda is a part, and the United States by this common struggle against the enemies of civilization have further strengthened the ties of friendship between our peoples. We all hope to return again to Bermuda when our purpose in this war has been achieved.

It is no easy task which confronts the conference. The magnitude of this problem and the difficulties attendant upon any completely satisfactory solution of it have, I believe, on the whole been underestimated. One thing is certain. We approach this problem with the conviction that every possible effort must be made to find the best possible solution which can be presented to all the United Nations for decisions. There can be no doubt of the good-will and intention of the British and American Governments nor of the delegations representing these Governments. What can be done will be done.

History records many instances of refugee migrations caused by oppression and tyranny,

but nowhere can be found a more terrible record than that of Nazi Germany. Since the present German Government came into power in 1933 its policy has been founded consistently upon the pattern of brutal subjection, persecution, pillage, and murder of small nations and religious and racial minorities. There is no need to dwell at length upon this subject. The facts are known to all the civilized peoples of this world.

From the inception of the present refugee policy the British and American Governments have, in close consultation, endeavored to alleviate in every possible and practicable manner the unhappy plight of these unfortunate peoples. These measures have not been confined to private effort. They have included the activities of the intergovernmental committee which was established in 1938 as a result of the Evian conference summoned by President Roosevelt. The activities of this committee were considerable. It might well have arrived at a satisfactory solution of the problem as it then existed had not the war intervened.

The war has had a two-fold effect upon the refugee situation. It has not only deepened the miseries of the peoples under German rule and augmented the difficulties of any attempt to relieve their suffering but has also created a wider problem of other populations and individuals who as a result of Nazi barbarism are in a plight calling for all our sympathy, consideration, and concrete action where this is practicable. Germany's ambition under Nazi ideology has resulted in a calculated policy of oppression and extermination, the effects of which extend far beyond the territories actually under its ruthless heel. This created the necessity for all possible assistance to such help-

¹ The chairman of the American delegation is Harold Willis Dodds, who delivered the address at Bermuda on Apr. 19, 1943.

less peoples, and it is under these conditions and with this purpose that this conference convenes.

The primary fact which must be borne in mind throughout these deliberations is that we are now in the middle of a bitterly contested war. We know that we will win this war, but we also know that we cannot relax for one instant our determination to concentrate our maximum effort upon its vigorous prosecution. Any other thought would not only be foolish; it would be criminal. It would constitute a betrayal, not of our countries or of the effort of the United Nations but of civilization. Complete and final victory will, of course, afford a true and final solution to the refugee problem. We fervently hope that in the better world which will arise such problems may never again return to harass civilization.

Despite these manifest limitations there is much that can and must be done, and I believe this conference will be successful in its endeavors to survey the problem as it exists today. It is naturally impossible for me at this time to forecast the probable course of our deliberations. One thing is certain, and that is that the problem is too great for solution by the two governments here represented. The cooperation of others must be solicited. Our task will be to point the way and to offer such definite proposals as may be possible under war conditions and in the light of what the war effort of the United Nations will permit.

It might be well at this point to mention some of the efforts already made on behalf of these people.

1. The participation of the United States in joint and several declarations of official condemnation of the policies and acts of the Axis governments and their satellites in oppressing and persecuting religious, racial, and political minorities.

2. The appropriation and expenditure of large amounts of public and private funds for the relief of persons suffering oppression and persecution because of their racial origin, of religious or political beliefs.

3. The application of the immigration laws of the United States in the utmost liberal and humane spirit of those laws.

4. The call by the President of the United States of the first intergovernmental conference at Evian-London in 1938 for the purpose of seeking a solution of refugee problems.

5. From the advent of the Hitler regime to June 30, 1942, American diplomatic and consular officers issued 547,775 visas to persons who were natives or nationals of the countries now dominated by Axis powers. A great majority of those persons were refugees from Nazi oppression and persecution. A total of 228,964 visas were issued during the war years 1939-42.

6. The United States authorized over 5,000 visas for permanent residence here to refugee children coming from France, Spain, and Portugal under arrangements by which certain private persons and organizations in the United States would be responsible for their care. Visas were also authorized for the parents accompanying them, in certain cases.

7. Considerable sums of money have been made available by the American Red Cross and from other American sources to the American Ambassador at Madrid for the care of refugees now in Spain pending their evacuation.

8. The American Red Cross and other American organizations have provided assistance for refugees who have been able to reach other neutral countries.

At this time I would like to express our full recognition of the burden assumed under the most difficult circumstances by His Britannic Majesty's Government in their efforts to alleviate the lot of those who have fallen innocent victims to the cruel philosophy of Nazi Germany. We recognize with appreciation what has already been accomplished by this other great democracy and realize fully that those accomplishments were effected during a period when the British Empire was faced with the alternative of total victory or of total extinction.

We also are fully confident that the British Government, in sending to this conference a delegation of such high distinction, has demonstrated its desire and determination to play its full part in whatever further measures of relief may be found possible.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

[Released to the press by the White House April 20]

The following statement was made by Judge Marvin Jones, chairman of the delegation from the United States to the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

"I think that the press reports about the secrecy of the food conference, whether intentional or not, are making a mountain out of a mole hill.

"I have taken the trouble to read the transcript of the President's press conference when the subject was discussed on March 19. The President was asked whether newspapermen would be permitted to cover the food conference when it occurred.

"The President replied facetiously that he hoped not, and his reply was greeted with laughter.

"This report indicates the humor in which the President replied to the question. In any event, the President has never expressed to me as chairman of the delegation any views as to the publicity of the conference. I expect to discuss the matter with Secretary Hull, and I have not the slightest doubt that arrangements will be made which, while not permitting representatives of the press to attend executive sessions, at the same time will give to the press all the information as to the proceedings that our newspaper representatives would believe right under the circumstances."

Treaty Information

AGRICULTURE

Development of Foodstuffs Production In Brazil

The Department of State has made public an agreement between the United States and Brazil for the development of foodstuffs production in Brazil, especially in the Amazon region, north and northeast, including the State of Baía,¹ which was signed in Rio de Janeiro on September 3, 1942 by Jefferson Caffery, American Ambassador at Rio de Janeiro, and Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, for the United States of America, and by Oswald Aranha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and

Apolonio Sales, Minister of Agriculture, for the United States of Brazil.

The agreement is effective for a period of two years beginning with the day of signature, and it is provided that the agreement may be extended in the judgment of the contracting parties.

Cooperative Rubber Investigations In Costa Rica

On April 3, 1943, notes were exchanged between the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at San José and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, effecting a supplementary agreement relating to coopera-

¹ Executive Agreement Series 302.

tive rubber investigations in Costa Rica for the purpose of defining more clearly certain procedures affecting the sale of products grown on the lands used by the rubber experiment station and in order to facilitate the continued development of rubber investigations and demonstration plantings in Costa Rica. The supplementary agreement is to remain in force as though it were an integral part of the agreement between the United States and Costa Rica effected by an exchange of notes signed April 19 and June 16, 1941, between the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at San José and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica,¹ which provides for cooperation between the Governments of the two countries in conducting investigations with respect to the methods of rubber-cultivation, the development of superior strains of rubber, disease control, use of intercrops, and other matters, with a view to the successful establishment of a self-sustaining rubber-culture industry. The agreement became effective on June 16, 1941, to remain in force until six months from the day on which either Government shall have given written notice to the other Government of its intention to terminate the agreement, provided, however, that the agreement shall not remain in force after June 30, 1943, except at the option of the United States Department of Agriculture, which option shall be notified to the Government of Costa Rica by the Government of the United States at least one month prior to that date.

HEALTH

Health and Sanitation Agreement With Venezuela

The American Embassy at Caracas, with a despatch dated April 2, 1943, transmitted to the Department a copy of the *Gaceta Oficial* of

¹ Executive Agreement Series 222.

Venezuela for March 29, 1943, containing the text of Decree No. 58, of March 26, 1943 issued by the President of Venezuela creating the Oficina Cooperativa Interamericana de Salud Pública, in accordance with the Health and Sanitation Agreement between the United States and Venezuela effected by an exchange of notes, signed February 18, 1943, between the American Ambassador at Caracas and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela.

The principal purpose of the agreement is the intensification of the anti-malarial campaign in Venezuela.

MILITARY MISSIONS

Agreement With El Salvador

By an exchange of notes, signed March 25, 1943, between the Minister of Foreign Affairs of El Salvador and the American Minister at San Salvador, there was effected an agreement for the extension, until such time as it shall be substituted by another agreement, of the agreement between the United States and El Salvador, signed in San Salvador on March 27, 1941,² for the detail of an officer of the United States Army to serve as Director of the Military School and of the Military Academy of El Salvador.

The agreement of March 27, 1941 contains provisions similar in general to provisions in agreements between the United States and certain other American republics providing for the detail of officers of the United States Army or Navy to advise the armed forces of those countries. The agreement was made effective for two years beginning March 27, 1941, it being provided further that if the Government of El Salvador should desire the services of the officer to be extended beyond the two-year period it should make a written proposal to that effect three months before the expiration of such period.

² Executive Agreement Series 214.

By a note of October 14, 1942 the Minister of Foreign Affairs informed the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at San Salvador of the desire of the Government of El Salvador that the agreement of March 27, 1941 be extended for two years. By a note of November 24, 1942 the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at San Salvador informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs that such extension was acceptable to the Government of the United States. The Department regarded this exchange of notes as constituting an agreement between the United States and El Salvador extending the agreement of March 27, 1941 for two years.¹ The agreement effected by exchange of notes signed March 25, 1943 extends the agreement of March 27, 1941 until substituted by another agreement.

AMITY

Treaty Between China and Iraq

The American Minister at Baghdad reported by a despatch dated February 8, 1943 that according to the Baghdad press the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the Treaty of Amity between China and Iraq signed on March 16, 1942 was effected at an official ceremony held at Ankara on February 5, 1943. Article IV of the treaty provides that the treaty shall enter into force 15 days after the exchange of the instruments of ratification at Ankara.

An official English text of the treaty is published in the *Iraq Government Gazette* dated June 14, 1942. A tentative translation of this treaty, in which it is referred to as a treaty of "friendship", was printed in the *BULLETIN* of August 1, 1942, page 679.

The treaty is accompanied by an exchange of notes between the respective plenipotentiaries of China and Iraq, dated March 16, 1942, confirming that the treaty shall apply in harmony with the provisions of the Treaty of Alliance between Iraq and Great Britain, signed at

Baghdad on June 30, 1930, and of the exchange of notes annexed thereto.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Agreement Regarding the 1943 Cuban Sugar Crop

On April 3, 1943 an agreement was entered into at Habana between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute (Instituto Cubano de Estabilización del Azucar) regarding the disposition of the crop of 1943 sugar to be produced in the Republic of Cuba. The agreement was signed for the Commodity Credit Corporation by the American Ambassador at Habana, Spruille Braden, and for the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute by the Prime Minister of the Government of Cuba, Dr. Ramon Zaydin, by the President of the Institute, Gaston Godoy, and by a Member of the Board of the Institute, Senator José Manuel Casanova. Under the agreement the Institute agrees to sell and the Commodity Credit Corporation agrees to purchase 2,700,000 tons of the 1943 Cuban sugar crop, in the form of raw sugar, at 2.65 cents per pound f.o.b. Cuban ports, upon terms and conditions set forth in the agreement. The agreement also provides that the 300,000 tons of the 1943 Cuban sugar to be marketed in other than United States markets shall be offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation before being offered to other purchasers. Furthermore, should any part of the 225,000 tons of the 1943 Cuban sugar crop allocated for local consumption in Cuba not be required for local consumption, such amount not required for local consumption shall be offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation before being offered to other purchasers.

On April 2 and 3, 1943, notes were exchanged between the American Ambassador at Habana and the Cuban Minister of State regarding the application of the agreement and the disposition of the 1942-crop molasses owned by the Defense Supplies Corporation.

¹ Executive Agreement Series 281.

Publications

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Haitian Finances: Supplementary Agreement Between the United States of America and Haiti—Signed at Port-au-Prince September 30, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 299. Publication 1908. 2 pp. 5¢. Control of American Citizens and Nationals Entering and Leaving Territory Under Jurisdiction of the United States (Revised to April 1, 1943). Passport Series 4. Publication 1910. 6 pp. 5¢.

Foreign Consular Offices in the United States. February 1, 1943. Publication 1911. iv, 46 pp. 10¢.

Military Service: Agreement Between the United States of America and Australia—Effectuated by exchanges of notes signed at Washington March 31, July 17, and September 16 and 30, 1942; effective July 18, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 303. Publication 1914. 5 pp. 5¢.

Military Service: Agreement Between the United States of America and Yugoslavia—Effectuated by exchanges of notes signed or dated at Washington March 31, May 14, June 25, and September 30, 1942; effective May 18, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 309. Publication 1919. 4 pp. 5¢.

Military Service: Agreement Between the United States of America and the Netherlands—Effectuated by exchanges of notes signed at Washington March 31, July 2, and September 24 and 30, 1942; effective July 8, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 306. Publication 1920. 7 pp. 5¢.

Military Service: Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa—Effectuated by exchanges of notes signed at Washington March 31, June 9, August 12, and October 7 and 31, 1942; effective June 11, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 310. Publication 1922. 7 pp. 5¢.

OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Official Publications of Present-Day Germany, Government, Corporate Organizations, and National Socialist Party, With an Outline of the Governmental Structure of Germany. 1942. (Library of Congress.) 130 pp. 20¢.

Legislation

Urgent Deficiencies in Certain Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1943 [State Department, salaries of ambassadors]:

Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 78th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 115. 83 pp.

S. Rept. 203, 78th Cong., on H. J. Res. 115. 2 pp.

Authorizing the Execution of Certain Obligations Under the Treaties of 1903 and 1906 with Panama:

S. Rept. 201, 78th Cong., on H. J. Res. 14. 7 pp.

S. Rept. 201 (pt. 2), 78th Cong., on H. J. Res. 14. (Minority views.) 13 pp.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1943

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
Price, 10 cents - - - - - Subscription price, \$2.75 a year

PUBLISHED WEEKLY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

